UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,815	08/11/2005	Doris Hjorth Hansen	133630-0001	1376
50659 BUTZEL LONG	7590 03/20/200 G	EXAMINER		
IP DOCKETIN	G DEPT	JACKSON, BRANDON LEE		
350 SOUTH MAIN STREET SUITE 300 ANN ARBOR, MI 48104			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3772	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/20/2009	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@butzel.com boudrie@butzel.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/536,815	HANSEN, DORIS HJORTH				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	BRANDON JACKSON	3772				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 De</u>	ecember 2008.					
	. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
<i>;</i> —	,					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 9-13</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 9-13</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P	te				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Notice of Informal Patent Application   Paper No(s)/Mail Date   Other:						

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to amendments/arguments filed 12/9/2008.

Currently, claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending in the instant application.

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/9/2008 has been entered.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 9-13 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/536,815 Page 3

Art Unit: 3772

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 3-6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaylord (US Patent 6,852,088). Gaylord discloses a support (10) to be worn by a patient (P) comprising an encircling band (11) having a portion of stretchable material (col. 6, lines 13-17) that is uniformly stretchable along the entire circumference of the band (11) and the band inherently has a tension after application. The band (11) includes a tensioning means (40) located within a pocket (51) on a front surface of the band (11) that is actuatable by the patient to vary the tension of the band between a base tension an another tension. The band (11) would automatically return to the base tension after handles (53) are released by the patient. The handles (53) are removeably attached to the band (11) via hook and loop fasteners. The band (11) is secured around the patient (P) with hook and loop fasteners (col. 6, lines 48-50). The band (11) is of uniform length and the support (10) lacks a mechanical moving part for mechanically adjusting its tension. The Gaylord device is sized to fit about the knee of a patient. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to size the device to fit around the user's chest, since a change in size is generally recognized

as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

With respect to claims 9-13, Gaylord discloses all the elements of the claimed invention; therefore, the method steps would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because they would have resulted from the use of the device.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaylord (US Patent 6,852,088) in view of Castel (US Patent 6,068,606). Gaylord substantially discloses the claimed invention; see rejection to claim 1 above. Gaylord fails to disclose shoulder straps. However, Castel teaches a circumferential support (Fig. 5) comprising shoulder straps (58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Gaylord device with shoulder straps, as taught by Castel, in order to stabilize the device and prevent downward, vertical movement when the device is applied to the patient's torso.

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Henz (US Patent 6,431,947).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3414. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8-5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/536,815

Art Unit: 3772

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571)272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon Jackson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3772 Page 5

BLJ

/Patricia Bianco/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3772